arXiv:1703.01617v1 [math.PR] 5 Mar 2017

COUPLINGS AND QUANTITATIVE CONTRACTION RATES FOR LANGEVIN DYNAMICS

ANDREAS EBERLE, ARNAUD GUILLIN, RAPHAEL ZIMMER

Abstract. We introduce a new probabilistic approach to quantify convergence to equilibrium for (kinetic) Langevin processes. In contrast to previous analytic approaches that focus on the associated kinetic Fokker-Planck equation, our approach is based on a specific combination of reflection and synchronous coupling of two solutions of the Langevin equation. It yields contractions in a particular Wasserstein distance, and it provides rather precise bounds for convergence to equilibrium at the borderline between the overdamped and the underdamped regime. In particular, we are able to recover kinetic behavior in terms of explicit lower bounds for the contraction rate. For example, for a rescaled double-well potential with local minima at distance a, we obtain a lower bound for the contraction rate of order $\Omega(a^{-1})$ provided the friction coefficient is of order $\Theta(a^{-1})$.

1. Introduction and main result

Suppose that U is a function in $C^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that ∇U is Lipschitz continuous, and let $u, \gamma \in (0,\infty)$. We consider a (kinetic) Langevin diffusion $(X_t, V_t)_{t\geq 0}$ with state space $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ that is given by the stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= V_t\,dt, \\ dV_t &= -\gamma V_t\,dt \,-\, u\,\nabla U(X_t)\,dt \,+\, \sqrt{2\gamma u}\,dB_t. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

Here $(B_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a d-dimensional Brownian motion that is defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$. Since the coefficients are Lipschitz continuous, a unique strong solution of the Langevin equation exists for any initial condition, and the solution gives rise to a strong Markov process with generator

$$\mathcal{L} \;=\; u\gamma\,\Delta_v \,-\, \gamma\, v\cdot\nabla_v \,-\, u\,\nabla U(x)\cdot\nabla_v \,+\, v\cdot\nabla_x\,. \tag{1.2}$$

The corresponding Kolmogorov forward equation is the *kinetic Fokker-Planck equation*. Under the assumptions on U imposed below, it can be verified that $\exp(-U) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and that the probability measure

$$\mu_*(dx\,dv) \;=\; \mathcal{Z}^{-1}\,e^{-U(x)-|v|^2/(2u)}\,dx\,dv, \quad \mathcal{Z} \;=\; (2\pi u)^{d/2}\int e^{-U(x)}\,dx, \tag{1.3}$$

Date: March 7, 2017.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60J60, 60H10, 35Q84, 35B40.

Key words and phrases. Langevin diffusion, kinetic Fokker-Planck equation, stochastic Hamiltonian dynamics, reflection coupling, convergence to equilibrium, hypocoercivity, quantitative bounds, Wasserstein distance, Lyapunov functions.

Financial support from DAAD and French government through the PROCOPE program, and from the German Science foundation through the *Hausdorff Center for Mathematics* is gratefully acknowledged.

is invariant for the transition semigroup $(p_t)_{t\geq 0}$, see e.g. [38, Proposition 6.1].

In statistical physics, the Langevin equation (1.1) describes the motion of a particle with position X_t and velocity V_t in a force field $b = -\nabla U$ subject to damping and random collisions [19, 45, 37, 30, 40]. In the physical interpretation, γ is the friction coefficient (per unit mass), and u is the inverse mass. Discretizations of the Langevin equation are relevant for molecular dynamics simulations [31]. Hamiltonian Monte Carlo methods for sampling and integral estimation are based on different types of discrete time analogues to Langevin dynamics [12, 36, 31, 6]. In numerical simulations, often a better performance of these HMC methods compared to traditional MCMC approaches is observed, but the corresponding convergence acceleration is still not well understood theoretically.

For these and other reasons, an important question is how to obtain explicit bounds on the speed of convergence of the law of (X_t, V_t) towards the invariant probability measure μ_*. Since the noise is only acting on the second component, the generator of the Langevin diffusion is degenerate, and thus classical approaches can not be applied in a straightforward way. Indeed, $\mathcal{L}$ is a typical example of a hypocoercive operator in the sense of Villani [43, 44]. Several analytic approaches to convergence to equilibrium for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations have been proposed during the last 15 years [10, 18, 29, 27, 28, 43, 44, 11, 7, 35, 21, 22, 3]. These are based respectively on Witten Laplacians and functional inequalities, semigroup theory, and in particular on hypocoercivity methods, see also [23] for some explorations around the Gaussian case and the effect of hypoellipticity. There are only few articles which study the ergodic properties of Langevin processes using more probabilistic arguments, cf. [41, 46, 33, 39, 1, 5, 20]. Most of these results ultimately rely on arguments used in Harris' type theorems, i.e., they assume a Lyapunov drift condition which implies recurrence of the process w.r.t. a compact set together with a control over the average excursion length. This condition is then combined with an argument showing that for starting points in the recurrent set, the transition probabilities are not singular w.r.t. each other. While the approaches are of a probabilistic nature, the behaviour of the process inside the recurrent set is not very transparent. Correspondingly, these approaches lead to qualitative rather than quantitative convergence results.

An open question asked by Villani in [42, Ch. 2, Bibliographical notes] is how to prove exponential convergence to equilibrium by a direct *coupling approach*. The motivation for this is two-fold: On the one hand, coupling methods often provide a good probabilistic understanding of the dynamics. On the other hand, couplings have been proven useful in establishing precise bounds on the long-time behaviour of non-degenerate diffusion processes [32, 8, 16, 13]. The only results for Langevin processes in this direction that we are aware of are rather restrictive: Under the assumption that the force field ∇U is a small perturbation of a linear function, Bolley, Guillin and Malrieu [5] use a synchronous coupling to show exponential mixing for (1.1) in L^2 Wasserstein distances. More recently, Gorham, Duncan, Vollmer and Mackey [20, Theorem 11] used synchronous coupling to derive a quantitative bound in the case of a strongly convex potential. Moreover, in [4, 2], couplings for

the Kolmogorov diffusion have been considered. This process solves an equation similar to (1.1) without damping and with $U \equiv 0$.

Here, and in the companion paper [17], we develop a novel coupling approach for Langevin equations that works for a much wider class of force fields. The intuition behind this approach can be described as follows: At first, we identify regions of the state space where the deterministic system corresponding to (1.1) admits a contraction property. We then use a mixture of synchronous coupling and reflection coupling to approximate a coupling which is sticky in these regions [14]. The speed of convergence is then measured in Kantorovich distances (L^1 Wasserstein distances) by adapting and optimizing the underlying (semi-)metric w.r.t. the given model and the chosen coupling. Here, we basically follow the strategy developed in [15, 16, 13], which is partially based on ideas from [25, 26, 9]. In these works, exponential Kantorovich contractions have been established for non-degenerate *overdamped* Langevin equations, yielding explicit and, in several cases, sharp convergence rates under the assumption that the corresponding potential is strictly convex outside a ball [15, 16], and under a Lyapunov drift condition [13], respectively. Our approach is also related to the application of the strategy described above to infinite-dimensional stochastic differential equations with possibly degenerate noise in [48], cf. also [24, 34].

Besides providing an intuitive understanding for the mechanism of convergence to equilibrium, the coupling approach yields both qualitatively new, and explicit quantitative results in several cases of interest. Before explaining the coupling construction and stating the results in detail, we illustrate this by an example:

Example 1.1 (Double-well potential)**.** Suppose that $U \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ is a Lipschitz continuous double-well potential defined by

$$U(x) \;=\; \begin{cases} (|x|-1)^2/2 & \text{for } |x| \geq 1/2, \\ 1/4 - |x|^2/2 & \text{for } |x| \leq 1/2, \end{cases}$$

and let $U_a(x) = U(x/a)$ be the rescaled potential with the same height for the potential well, but minima at distance $2a$. Then our main result shows that for any $a, u, \gamma \in (0, \infty)$ there exist a constant $c \in (0, \infty)$, a semimetric ρ on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$, and a corresponding Kantorovich semimetric $\mathcal{W}_\rho$ such that for all probability measures μ, ν on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$,

$$\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu p_t, \nu p_t) \;\leq\; e^{-ct}\, \mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu, \nu) \qquad \text{for any } t \geq 0.$$

As a consequence, we also obtain convergence to equilibrium in the standard L^2 Wasserstein distance with the same exponential rate c. Below, we give explicit lower bounds for the contraction rate. For example, if $\gamma a \geq \sqrt{30\, u}$ then

$$c \;\geq\; \frac{\sqrt{u}}{107} \min\left((\gamma a)^{-4} u^2,\, e^{-8} (\gamma a)^{-2} u,\, 2^{-3/2} e^{-8}\right) a^{-1},$$

see Example 1.13 (with parameters $\mathcal{R} = 4a$, $L = a^{-2}$ and $\beta = L\mathcal{R}^2/2 = 8$). In general, if the value of γa and u are fixed (i.e., the friction coefficient γ is adjusted to the potential) then the contraction rate is of order $\Omega(a^{-1})$, i.e., $c \geq c_0 \cdot a^{-1}$ for a positive constant c_0. This clearly reflects the *kinetic behaviour*, and it is in

contrast to the rate $O(a^{-2})$ for convergence to equilibrium of the overdamped limit $dX_t = -u\,\nabla U(X_t)\,dt + \sqrt{2u}\,dB_t$.

1.1. **Idea for coupling construction.** We first explain the idea behind the construction of the coupling in an informal way. Suppose that $((X_t, V_t), (X'_t, V'_t))$ is an arbitrary coupling of two solutions of the Langevin equation (1.1) driven by Brownian motions (B_t) and (B'_t). Then the difference process $(Z_t, W_t) = (X_t - X'_t, V_t - V'_t)$ satisfies the stochastic differential equation

$$\begin{aligned} dZ_t &= W_t\,dt, \\ dW_t &= -\gamma W_t\,dt - u\,(\nabla U(X_t) - \nabla U(X'_t))\,dt + \sqrt{2\gamma u}\,d(B - B')_t. \end{aligned}$$

Introducing the new coordinates $Q_t = Z_t + \gamma^{-1} W_t$, the system takes the form

$$dZ_t = -\gamma Z_t\,dt + \gamma Q_t\,dt, \tag{1.4}$$

$$dQ_t = -u\gamma^{-1}\,(\nabla U(X_t) - \nabla U(X'_t))\,dt + \sqrt{2u\gamma^{-1}}\,d(B - B')_t. \tag{1.5}$$

Since $\gamma > 0$, the first equation is contractive if $Q_t = 0$. The key idea is now to apply a synchronous coupling whenever $Q_t = 0$, and a reflection coupling if $Q_t \neq 0$ and $\alpha|Z_t| + |Q_t| < R_1$ with appropriate constants $\alpha, R_1 \in (0, \infty)$, cf. Figure 1. The synchronous coupling guarantees that the noise coefficient in (1.5) vanishes if $Q_t = 0$, i.e., the dynamics is not driven away from the "contractive region" by random fluctuations (although it may leave this region by the drift). On the other hand, the reflection coupling for $Q_t \neq 0$ ensures that the contractive region is recurrent. The resulting coupling process is a diffusion on $\mathbb{R}^{4d}$ that is sticky on the $3d$-dimensional hyperplane $\{(x, v, x', v') \in \mathbb{R}^{4d} : x - x' + \gamma^{-1}(v - v') = 0\}$ of contractive states, i.e., it spends a positive amount of time in this region, cf. [14]. By designing a special semi-metric ρ on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ that is based on a concave function of the distance and on a Lyapunov function, we can then (similarly as in [13]) make use of the random fluctuations and of a drift condition in order to derive average contractivity for the coupling distance $\rho((X_t, V_t), (X'_t, V'_t))$.

The construction of a coupling and the proof of contractivity are carried out rigorously in Sections 2 and 3. Since the construction and control of the sticky couplings described above is possible but technically involved, we actually use approximations of such couplings to derive our results.

1.2. **Drift condition and Lyapunov function.** We now make the following assumption that guarantees, among other things, that the process is non-explosive:

Assumption 1.2. There exist constants $L, A \in (0, \infty)$ and $\lambda \in (0, 1/4]$ such that

$$U(x) \geq 0 \qquad \text{for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.6}$$

$$|\nabla U(x) - \nabla U(y)| \leq L\,|x - y| \qquad \text{for any } x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \text{and} \tag{1.7}$$

$$x \cdot \nabla U(x)/2 \geq \lambda\,(U(x) + u^{-1}\gamma^2|x|^2/4) - A \qquad \text{for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.8}$$

Notice that the assumption can only be satisfied if

$$\lambda \leq 2Lu\gamma^{-2}. \tag{1.9}$$

Up to the choice of the constants, the drift condition (1.8) is equivalent to the simplified drift condition (1.29) considered further below. It implies the existence of a Lyapunov function for the Langevin process. Indeed, let

$$\mathcal{V}(x,v) \;=\; U(x) \,+\, \frac{1}{4}u^{-1}\gamma^2 \left(|x+\gamma^{-1}v|^2 + |\gamma^{-1}v|^2 - \lambda|x|^2\right). \tag{1.10}$$

Note that since $\lambda \le 1/4$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(x,v) \;&\ge\; U(x) \,+\, \frac{1}{4}(1-2\lambda)u^{-1}\gamma^2 \left(|x+\gamma^{-1}v|^2 + |\gamma^{-1}v|^2\right) \\ &\ge\; \frac{1}{8}(1-2\lambda)u^{-1}\gamma^2|x|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{1.11}$$

In particular, $\mathcal{V}(x,v) \to \infty$ as $|(x,v)| \to \infty$. Moreover:

Lemma 1.3. *If the drift condition* (1.8) *holds then* $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V} \le \gamma\,(d + A - \lambda\mathcal{V})$.

The proof of the lemma is included in Appendix A. The choice of the Lyapunov function is motivated by Mattingly, Stuart and Higham [33], see also [41, 46, 1].

In combination with (1.11), the lemma shows that the process $\mathcal{V}(X_t, V_t)$ is decreasing on average in regions where $|X_t| \ge 8^{1/2}(d+A)^{1/2}u^{1/2}\gamma^{-1}(\lambda - 2\lambda^2)^{-1/2}$.

1.3. **Choice of metric.** Next, we introduce an appropriate semi-metric on $\mathbb{R}^d$ w.r.t. which the coupling considered below will be contractive on average. Inspired by [25], a similar semi-metric has been considered in [13]. For $(x,v),(x',v') \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ we set

$$r((x,v),(x',v')) \;=\; \alpha|x-x'| + |x-x'+\gamma^{-1}(v-v')| \tag{1.12}$$

$$\rho((x,v),(x',v')) \;=\; f(r((x,v),(x',v'))) \cdot (1 + \varepsilon\mathcal{V}(x,v) + \varepsilon\mathcal{V}(x',v')), \tag{1.13}$$

where $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0,\infty)$ are appropriately chosen positive constants, and $f : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is a continuous, non-decreasing concave function such that $f(0) = 0$, f is C^2 on $(0, R_1)$ for some constant $R_1 \in (0,\infty)$ with right-sided derivative $f'_+(0) = 1$ and left-sided derivative $f'_-(R_1) > 0$, and f is constant on $[R_1,\infty)$. The function f and the constants α, ε and R_1 will be chosen explicitly below in order to optimize the resulting contraction rates. For the moment let us just note that by concavity,

$$\min(r, R_1)\, f'_-(R_1) \le f(r) \le \min(r, f(R_1)) \le \min(r, R_1) \quad \text{for any } r \ge 0. \tag{1.14}$$

For probability measures μ, ν on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ we define

$$\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu,\nu) \;=\; \inf_{\Gamma\in\Pi(\mu,\nu)} \int \rho((x,v),(x',v'))\; \Gamma(d(x,v)\, d(x',v')) \tag{1.15}$$

where the infimum is over all couplings of μ and ν. We remark that ρ and the corresponding transportation cost $\mathcal{W}_\rho$ are semimetrics but not necessarily metrics, i.e., the triangle inequality may be violated. An important remark is that the distance r can be controlled by the Lyapunov function. Indeed, let

$$R_1 \;:=\; 4 \cdot (6/5)^{1/2} \left(1 + 2\alpha + 2\alpha^2\right)^{1/2} (d+A)^{1/2}\, u^{1/2}\gamma^{-1} \left(\lambda - 2\lambda^2\right)^{-1/2}. \tag{1.16}$$



FIGURE 1. Sketch of coupling approach

By (1.11) and since $U \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} r((x,v),(x',v'))^2 &\leq \big((1+\alpha)|x-x'+\gamma^{-1}(v-v')| + \alpha|\gamma^{-1}(v-v')|\big)^2 \\ &\leq 2\left((1+\alpha)^2+\alpha^2\right)\left(|x+\gamma^{-1}v|^2 + |x'+\gamma^{-1}v'|^2 + |\gamma^{-1}v|^2 + |\gamma^{-1}v'|^2\right) \\ &\leq 8\left((1+\alpha)^2+\alpha^2\right)(1-2\lambda)^{-1}u\gamma^{-2}\ \left(\mathcal{V}(x,v)+\mathcal{V}(x',v')\right) \end{aligned} \tag{1.17}$$

for any $(x,v),(x',v') \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. Hence for $r((x,v),(x',v')) \geq R_1$,

$$\mathcal{V}(x,v) + \mathcal{V}(x',v') \geq \frac{12}{5}(d+A)/\lambda, \qquad \text{and thus} \tag{1.18}$$

$$\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V}(x,v) + \mathcal{L}\mathcal{V}(x',v') \leq -\frac{1}{6}\,\gamma\lambda\ \left(\mathcal{V}(x,v)+\mathcal{V}(x',v')\right) \tag{1.19}$$

by Lemma 1.3. The bound (1.19) guarantees that for the coupling to be considered below, the process $\rho_t := \rho((X_t,V_t),(X_t',V_t'))$ is decreasing on average if $r_t := r((X_t,V_t),(X_t',V_t')) \geq R_1$. We will show that by choosing the coupling and the parameters α, ε and f defining the metric in an adequate way, we can ensure that ρ_t is also decreasing on average (up to a small error term) for $r_t < R_1$. As a consequence, we will obtain our basic contraction result.

1.4. **Main result.** We can now state our main result:

Theorem 1.4. *Suppose that Assumption 1.2 is satisfied. Then there exist constants $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0,\infty)$ and a continuous non-decreasing concave function $f : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ with $f(0) = 0$ such that for all probability measures μ, ν on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$,*

$$\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu p_t, \nu p_t) \;\le\; e^{-ct}\,\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu,\nu) \qquad \text{for any } t \ge 0, \tag{1.20}$$

where the contraction rate c is given by

$$c \;=\; \frac{\gamma}{384}\min\left(\lambda L u \gamma^{-2},\, \Lambda^{1/2} e^{-\Lambda} L u \gamma^{-2},\, \Lambda^{1/2} e^{-\Lambda}\right) \qquad \text{with} \tag{1.21}$$

$$\Lambda \;:=\; L R_1^2/8 \;=\; \frac{12}{5}(1 + 2\alpha + 2\alpha^2)(d + A) L u \gamma^{-2} \lambda^{-1} (1 - 2\lambda)^{-1}. \tag{1.22}$$

Explicitly, one can choose the constants α, ε, and the function f determining ρ in such a way that

$$\alpha \;=\; (1 + \Lambda^{-1}) L u \gamma^{-2} \;\le\; \frac{11}{6} L u \gamma^{-2}, \qquad \varepsilon \;=\; 4\gamma^{-1} c/(d + A), \tag{1.23}$$

and f is constant on $[R_1,\infty)$ and C^2 on $(0, R_1)$ with

$$\frac{1}{2} e^{-2} \exp(-L r^2/8) \;\le\; f'(r) \;\le\; \exp(-L r^2/8) \quad \text{for } r \in (0, R_1). \tag{1.24}$$

More precisely, f is defined by (3.2), (3.3) *and* (3.4) *below.*

Remark 1.5. The constant Λ depends on the parameters L, u and γ both explicitly and through λ and α. By (1.9), we always have

$$\Lambda \;\ge\; 6(d + A)/5 \;\ge\; 6/5. \tag{1.25}$$

Corresponding upper bounds are given in Lemma 1.9 below.

Remark 1.6. We shortly comment on the requirement that ∇U is Lipschitz, cf. Assumption 1.2 further above. This condition is not necessary to conclude exponential convergence to equilibrium in Kantorovich distances, cf. [33, Theorem 3.2]. We have chosen to limit ourselves here to the Lipschitz case to concentrate on the key techniques rather than on tedious calculations. In the case of overdamped Langevin equations, the contraction results from [13] are extended in [47] replacing global Lipschitz bounds by local ones. In a similar spirit, it might be possible to extend the results presented here. However, optimizing and keeping track of the constants is more involved in this case.

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is given in Section 4. As a preparation, we introduce the relevant couplings in Section 2, and we apply these to derive a more general contraction result in Section 3. Theorem 1.4 will be obtained from this more general result by choosing the constants α and ε in a specific way.

Theorem 1.4 directly implies convergence of the Langevin process to a unique stationary distribution with exponential rate c:

Corollary 1.7. *In the setting of Theorem 1.4 there exists a constant $C \in (0,\infty)$ such that for all probability measures μ, ν on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$,*

$$\mathcal{W}^2(\mu p_t, \nu p_t)^2 \;\le\; C e^{-ct}\,\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu,\nu) \qquad \text{for any } t \ge 0. \tag{1.26}$$

Here, $\mathcal{W}^2$ denotes the standard L^2 Wasserstein distance w.r.t. the euclidean metric. In particular, μ_* is the unique invariant probability measure for the Langevin process, and μp_t converges towards μ_* exponentially fast with rate c for any initial law μ such that $\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu,\mu_*) < \infty$. Here, the constant c and the semimetric ρ are given as in Theorem 1.4, and the constant C can be chosen explicitly as

$$C \;=\; 2\,e^{2+\Lambda}\,\frac{(1+\gamma)^2}{\min(1,\alpha)^2}\,\max\bigl(1,\,4\,(1+2\alpha+2\alpha^2)(d+A)u\gamma^{-1}c^{-1}/\min(1,R_1)\bigr)\;.$$

The proof is given in Section 4.

1.5. **Bounds under simplified drift condition.** In order to make the dependence of the bounds on the parameters more explicit, we now replace (1.8) by a simplified drift condition. Instead of Assumption 1.2, we assume:

Assumption 1.8. There exist constants $L, \mathcal{R}, \beta \in (0,\infty)$ such that

$$U(0) \;=\; 0 \;=\; \min U, \tag{1.27}$$

$$|\nabla U(x) - \nabla U(y)| \;\le\; L\,|x-y| \qquad \text{for any } x,y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \text{and} \tag{1.28}$$

$$x \cdot \nabla U(x) \;\ge\; \beta \cdot (|x|/\mathcal{R})^2 \quad \text{for any } x \in \mathbb{R}^d \text{ s.t. } |x| \ge \mathcal{R}. \tag{1.29}$$

Observe that (1.27) may be assumed w.l.o.g. by subtracting a constant and shifting the coordinate system such that the global minimum of U (which exists if (1.29) holds) is attained at 0. The Lipschitz condition (1.28) has been assumed before, and up to the values of the constants, the drift condition (1.29) is equivalent to (1.8). This condition guarantees that the x marginal of the invariant probability measure (1.3) concentrates on balls of radius $O(\mathcal{R})$. Notice that if (1.28) and (1.29) are both satisfied then

$$\beta \;\le\; L\mathcal{R}^2. \tag{1.30}$$

Lemma 1.9. *Suppose that Assumption 1.8 is satisfied. Then Assumption 1.2 holds with*

$$A \;=\; (L\mathcal{R}^2 - \beta)/8 \quad \textit{and} \quad \lambda \;=\; \min\left(\frac{1}{4},\,\frac{\beta}{L\mathcal{R}^2}\cdot\frac{2Lu\gamma^{-2}}{1+2Lu\gamma^{-2}}\right). \tag{1.31}$$

Furthermore, if $Lu\gamma^{-2} \le 1/8$ then the constant Λ in Theorem 1.4 is bounded by

$$\frac{6}{5}(d+A)L\mathcal{R}^2/\beta \;\le\; \Lambda \;\le\; \frac{6}{5}(d+A)(1+20\,Lu\gamma^{-2})\,L\mathcal{R}^2/\beta. \tag{1.32}$$

In general, there is an explicit constant $C_1 \in (0,\infty)$ such that

$$\frac{6}{5}(d+A)L\mathcal{R}^2/\beta \;\le\; \Lambda \;\le\; \frac{12}{5}(d+A)(1+C_1Lu\gamma^{-2})^3\,L\mathcal{R}^2/\beta. \tag{1.33}$$

The proof is included in Appendix A. The lemma shows that if Assumption 1.8 holds with fixed constants $L, \mathcal{R}, \beta \in (0,\infty)$, then there is a lower bound for the contraction rate in Theorem 1.4 that only depends on the natural parameters γ, $Lu\gamma^{-2}$, $L\mathcal{R}^2$ and β. The bound is particularly nice if there is sufficient damping:

Corollary 1.10. *Let $\ell \in [1,\infty)$, and suppose that Assumption 1.8 is satisfied with constants $L, \mathcal{R}, \beta \in (0,\infty)$ such that $\beta \geq L\mathcal{R}^2/\ell$. Suppose further that $Lu\gamma^{-2} \leq 1/30$. Then the assertion of Theorem 1.4 holds with a contraction rate*

$$\begin{aligned} c &\geq \frac{\gamma}{205} \min\left(\frac{1}{\ell}(Lu\gamma^{-2})^2,\, \frac{1}{2}\min\left(d^{1/2}Lu\gamma^{-2}, \Lambda_1^{-1/2}\right) e^{-\Lambda_1}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{\sqrt{\beta u}}{38} \min\left(\frac{1}{\ell}(Lu\gamma^{-2})^2,\, \frac{1}{2}\min\left(d^{1/2}Lu\gamma^{-2}, \Lambda_1^{-1/2}\right) e^{-\Lambda_1}\right) \mathcal{R}^{-1}, \end{aligned} \tag{1.34}$$

where $\Lambda_1 := (\ell-1)L\mathcal{R}^2/4 + 2\ell d$.

The proof of the corollary is given in Section 4. Bounds of the same order as in (1.34) hold if the constant $1/30$ is replaced by any other strictly positive constant. The specific value $1/30$ has been chosen in a somehow ad hoc way in order to obtain relatively small constants in the prefactors.

Remark 1.11 (Kinetic behaviour, Hamiltonian Monte Carlo)**.** Corollary 1.10 shows that by adjusting the friction coefficient γ appropriately, one can obtain a kinetic lower bound for the contraction rate: If γ is chosen such that the value of $Lu\gamma^{-2}$ is a given constant, and the parameters β and ℓ are fixed as well (i.e., $L\mathcal{R}^2$ is within a fixed range), then the lower bound for c in (1.34) is of order $\Omega(\mathcal{R}^{-1})$. This should be relevant for MCMC methods based on discretizations of Langevin equations [36, 31, 6], because it indicates that by adjusting γ appropriately, one can improve on the diffusive order $O(\mathcal{R}^{-2})$ for the convergence rate to equilibrium.

Before discussing the parameter dependence of the lower bounds for the contraction rate c that have been stated above, we check the quality of the bounds in the linear case and for drifts that are linear outside a ball:

Example 1.12 (Linear drift)**.** Suppose that $U(x) = L|x|^2/2$. Then (1.1) reads

$$dX_t = V_t\,dt, \qquad dV_t = -\gamma V_t\,dt - u\,LX_t\,dt + \sqrt{2\gamma u}\,dB_t. \tag{1.35}$$

Applying Corollary 1.10 with $\beta = L\mathcal{R}^2$ and $\ell = 1$ shows that for $Lu\gamma^{-2} \leq 1/30$,

$$c \geq \frac{\gamma}{205} \min\left((Lu\gamma^{-2})^2,\, \frac{1}{2}e^{-2d}\min\left(d^{1/2}Lu\gamma^{-2}, (2d)^{-1/2}\right)\right). \tag{1.36}$$

Lower bounds of a similar order can be derived from Theorem 1.4 if $Lu\gamma^{-2}$ is bounded from above by a fixed constant. On the other hand, the linear Langevin equation (1.35) can be solved explicitly. The solution is a Gaussian process. By [38, Section 6.3], the L^2 spectral gap of the corresponding generator is

$$c_{gap} = \left(1 - \sqrt{(1-4Lu\gamma^{-2})^+}\right)\gamma/2, \qquad \text{and, in particular,} \tag{1.37}$$

$$\gamma\,\min(1/4, Lu\gamma^{-2}) \leq c_{gap} \leq \gamma\,\min(1/2, 2Lu\gamma^{-2}). \tag{1.38}$$

The spectral gap provides an upper bound for the contraction rate c. For example, for $d = 1$ and $Lu\gamma^{-2} = 1/30$, we obtain the lower bound

$$c \geq \frac{\gamma}{184500} \approx \frac{1}{33685}\,(Lu)^{1/2} \tag{1.39}$$

for the contraction rate, whereas the upper bound given by the spectral gap is

$$c_{gap} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\gamma\,(1-\sqrt{1-4/30}) \;\approx\; \frac{\gamma}{29} \;\approx\; \frac{1}{5.3}(Lu)^{1/2}.$$

Example 1.13 (Multi-well potentials, linear drift outside a ball)**.** Assumption 1.8 with $\beta = L\mathcal{R}^2/2$ is satisfied for the one-dimensional double-well potential

$$U(x) \;=\; \begin{cases} L|x|^2/2 & \text{for } x \le \mathcal{R}/8, \\ -L(x-\mathcal{R}/4)^2/2 + L\mathcal{R}^2/64 & \text{for } \mathcal{R}/8 \le x \le 3\mathcal{R}/8, \\ L(x-\mathcal{R}/2)^2/2 & \text{for } x \ge 3\mathcal{R}/8, \end{cases}$$

and also for the triple-well potential $\widetilde{U}(x) = U(|x|)$. Here, for $Lu\gamma^{-2} \le 1/30$, Corollary 1.10 yields the lower bounds

$$\begin{aligned} c \;&\ge\; \frac{\gamma}{410}\,\min\Big((Lu\gamma^{-2})^2,\, \min\big(d^{1/2}Lu\gamma^{-2}, (4d+L\mathcal{R}^2/4)^{-1/2}\big)\; e^{-4d-L\mathcal{R}^2/4}\Big) \\ (1.40)\;&\ge\; \frac{\sqrt{\beta u}}{75\,\mathcal{R}}\,\min\Big((Lu\gamma^{-2})^2,\, \min\big(d^{1/2}Lu\gamma^{-2}, (4d+L\mathcal{R}^2/4)^{-1/2}\big)\; e^{-4d-L\mathcal{R}^2/4}\Big) \end{aligned}$$

for the contraction rate. Again, lower bounds of similar order hold if $Lu\gamma^{-2}$ is bounded from above by a fixed constant. More generally, we obtain corresponding bounds if U is a potential satisfying conditions (1.27) and (1.28), and there exist constants $\mathcal{R} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|a| \le \mathcal{R}/2$ such that $\nabla U(x) = L\,(x-a)$ for $|x| \ge \mathcal{R}$. The lower bound is of order $\Theta(\mathcal{R}^{-1})$ if $Lu\gamma^{-2}$ is fixed and $L\mathcal{R}^2$ is bounded from above by a fixed constant.

We stress that in low dimensions, we can obtain numerical values for our lower bounds that are in reach for current computer simulations. This is quite remarkable because we have lost some factors during our estimates. For high dimensions, our bounds deteriorate rapidly.

1.6. **Parameter dependence of lower bounds for the contraction rate.** We now discuss the parameter dependence of the bounds derived above, and we compare our results to previously derived bounds on convergence to equilibrium for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations.

Let us first recall that the computation of the spectrum shows that in the linear case, there are two different regimes, cf. [38]. For $Lu\gamma^{-2} \ge 1/4$ (*underdamped regime*), the spectral gap (1.37) is a linear function of γ. In this case, the friction coefficient γ is so small that the rate of convergence to equilibrium is determined by γ. Conversely, for $Lu\gamma^{-2} \le 1/4$, the spectral gap is a decreasing function of γ. In this regime, the rate of convergence to equilibrium is determined by the transfer of noise from the v-variable to the x-variable. If γ increases then the noise is damped more strongly before it can be transferred to the x-component, and hence the rate of convergence decreases. In particular, the spectral gap as a function of γ has a sharp maximum for $Lu\gamma^{-2} = 1/4$.

Comparing (1.38) and (1.21), we see that our general lower bound for the contraction rate contains similar terms as the bounds in (1.38). However, these terms are multiplied by constants that again depend on the parameters L, u and γ. We



FIGURE 2. Spectral gap for $U(x) = |x|^2/2$ and $u = 1$

now discuss the parameter dependence of the lower bounds in different regimes:

$Lu\gamma^{-2} \to 0$ *(overdamped case).* As $Lu\gamma^{-2} \to 0$, the lower bound in (1.34) is of order $\Omega\left(\gamma(Lu\gamma^{-2})^2\right)$. This differs from the order $\Theta\left(\gamma\, Lu\gamma^{-2}\right)$ of the spectral gap in the linear case by a factor $Lu\gamma^{-2}$.

$Lu\gamma^{-2}$ *fixed (kinetic case).* If the friction coefficient γ is chosen such that the value of $Lu\gamma^{-2}$ is a given constant, and the parameters β and $L\mathcal{R}^2$ are fixed as well, then the lower bound in (1.34) is of order $\Omega\left(\mathcal{R}^{-1}\right)$.

$Lu\gamma^{-2} \to \infty$ *(underdamped case).* For large values of $Lu\gamma^{-2}$, our bounds for the contraction rate in Lemma 1.9 are considerably worse than the order $\Theta(\gamma)$ of the spectral gap in the linear case. This is not surprising, because for small γ it is not clear, how the contractive term $-\gamma V_t$ in (1.1) can make up for the term $-u\nabla U(X_t)$ with a potential U that may be locally very non-convex.

$L\mathcal{R}^2 \to \infty$. For large values of $L\mathcal{R}^2$, the lower bound in (1.34) degenerates exponentially in this parameter. This is natural because U could be a double-well potential with valleys of depth $\Theta(L\mathcal{R}^2)$, see the example above.

$d \to \infty$. Our bounds depend exponentially on the dimension. In the general setup considered here, this is unavoidable. An important open question is whether a better dimension dependence can be obtained for a restricted class of models. For overdamped Langevin diffusions, corresponding results have been obtained for example in [16, 48, 47].

Let us now set our results in relation to explicit bounds for convergence to equilibrium of kinetic Fokker-Planck equations that have been obtained in [29, 44, 11] by analytic methods. These results are not directly comparable, because they quantify convergence to equilibrium in different distances (e.g. in weighted L^2 or Sobolev norms, or in relative entropy). Moreover, the constants have not always been tracked as precisely as here. Nevertheless, it seems plausible to compare the orders of the convergence rates. Already in [29, Theorem 0.1], Hérau and Nier have derived a nice explicit bound on the convergence rate in weighted Sobolev spaces under quite general conditions. However, even in the linear case, this bound is far from sharp in the overdamped regime and at the boundary between the overdamped and the underdamped regime. In particular, it seems not to be able to recover kinetic behavior for properly adjusted friction coefficients. Most of the

more recent works are based on extensions of Villani's hypocoercivity approach [44]. In particular, explicit bounds are given in [44, Section 7] in H^1 norms, corresponding bounds in L^2 norms can be deduced from [11], and recently some Wasserstein bounds have been derived in [35]. However, we have not been able to recover a similar behaviour as above for the bounds on the convergence rates in these results.

2. Coupling and evolution of coupling distance

We fix a positive constant ξ. Eventually, we will consider the limit $\xi \downarrow 0$. In order to couple two solutions of (1.1), we consider the following SDE on $\mathbb{R}^{2d} \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
dX_t &= V_t\,dt, \\
dV_t &= -\gamma V_t\,dt - u\,\nabla U(X_t)\,dt + \sqrt{2\gamma u}\; rc(Z_t, W_t)\,dB_t^{rc} \\
&\qquad + \sqrt{2\gamma u}\; sc(Z_t, W_t)\,dB_t^{sc}, \\
dX_t' &= V_t'\,dt, \\
dV_t' &= -\gamma V_t'\,dt - u\,\nabla U(X_t')\,dt + \sqrt{2\gamma u}\; rc(Z_t, W_t)\,(I_d - 2e_t e_t^T)\,dB_t^{rc} \\
&\qquad + \sqrt{2\gamma u}\; sc(Z_t, W_t)\,dB_t^{sc}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

Here B^{rc} and B^{sc} are independent Brownian motions,

$$Z_t = X_t - X_t', \quad W_t = V_t - V_t', \quad Q_t = Z_t + \gamma^{-1} W_t, \tag{2.2}$$

$$e_t = Q_t/|Q_t| \quad \text{if } Q_t \neq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad e_t = 0 \quad \text{if } Q_t = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Moreover, $rc, sc : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to [0,1]$ are Lipschitz continuous functions such that $rc^2 + sc^2 \equiv 1$,

$$rc(z,w) = 0 \quad \text{if } z + \gamma^{-1} w = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \alpha|z| + |z + \gamma^{-1} w| \geq R_1 + \xi, \tag{2.4}$$

$$rc(z,w) = 1 \quad \text{if } |z + \gamma^{-1} w| \geq \xi \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha|z| + |z + \gamma^{-1} w| \leq R_1. \tag{2.5}$$

The values of the constants $\alpha, R_1 \in (0, \infty)$ will be fixed later. Note that by (2.4), $rc(Z_t, W_t) e_t e_t^T$ is a Lipschitz continuous function of (X_t, V_t, X_t', V_t'). Therefore, existence and uniqueness of the coupling process holds by Itô's theorem. Moreover, by Lévy's characterization, for any solution of (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned}
B_t &= \int_0^t rc(Z_s, W_s)\,dB_s^{rc} + \int_0^t sc(Z_s, W_s)\,dB_s^{sc} \qquad \text{and} \\
B_t' &= \int_0^t rc(Z_s, W_s)\,(I_d - 2e_s e_s^T)\,dB_s^{rc} + \int_0^t sc(Z_s, W_s)\,dB_s^{sc}
\end{aligned}$$

are again Brownian motions. Thus (2.1) defines indeed a coupling of two solutions of (1.1). For $rc \equiv 1$ and $sc \equiv 0$, the coupling is a *reflection coupling*, whereas for $rc \equiv 0$ and $sc \equiv 1$ it is a *synchronous coupling*. By (2.4) and (2.5), we choose rc and sc such that the synchronous coupling is applied when $r_t = \alpha|Z_t| + |Q_t|$ is large or Q_t is close to 0, and the reflection coupling is applied otherwise. Ideally, we would like to choose $rc(Z_t, W_t) = 1_{\{Q_t \neq 0,\, r_t < R_1\}}$. Since the indicator function is not continuous, we consider Lipschitz continuous approximations instead.

The processes $(Z_t), (W_t)$ and (Q_t) satisfy the following equations:

$$dZ_t = W_t\,dt = \gamma Q_t\,dt - \gamma Z_t\,dt, \tag{2.6}$$

$$dW_t = -\gamma W_t\,dt - u(\nabla U(X_t) - \nabla U(X_t'))\,dt + \sqrt{8\gamma u}\,rc(Z_t, W_t) e_t e_t^T\,dB_t^{rc}, \tag{2.7}$$

$$dQ_t = -u\gamma^{-1}(\nabla U(X_t) - \nabla U(X_t'))\,dt + \sqrt{8\gamma^{-1}u}\,rc(Z_t, W_t)\,e_t e_t^T\,dB_t^{rc}. \tag{2.8}$$

Note that in particular, Z_t is contractive when $Q_t = 0$, and Q_t would be a local martingale if U would be constant. We set

$$r_t := r((X_t, V_t), (X_t', V_t')) = \alpha|Z_t| + |Q_t|, \qquad \text{and} \tag{2.9}$$

$$\rho_t := \rho((X_t, V_t), (X_t', V_t')) = f(r_t) \cdot G_t, \qquad \text{where} \tag{2.10}$$

$$G_t := 1 + \varepsilon\mathcal{V}(X_t, V_t) + \varepsilon\mathcal{V}(X_t', V_t'). \tag{2.11}$$

Lemma 2.1. *Let $c, \varepsilon \in (0, \infty)$ and $f : [0, \infty) \to [0, \infty)$ be continuous, non-decreasing and concave such that f is C^2 except for finitely many points. Let*

$$\alpha = (1 + \eta)Lu\gamma^{-2} \tag{2.12}$$

for some constant $\eta \in (0, \infty)$. Then

$$e^{ct}\rho_t \le \rho_0 + \gamma \int_0^t e^{cs} K_s\,ds + M_t \qquad \text{for any } t \ge 0, \tag{2.13}$$

where (M_t) is a continuous local martingale, and

$$\begin{aligned} K_t &= 4u\gamma^{-2}\,rc(Z_t, W_t)^2 f''(r_t)\,G_t \\ &\quad + (\alpha|Q_t| - \frac{\eta}{1+\eta}\alpha|Z_t|)\,f_-'(r_t)\,G_t + 4\varepsilon\max(1, (2\alpha)^{-1})\,rc(Z_t, W_t)^2\,r_t f_-'(r_t) \\ &\quad + (2(d + A) - \lambda\mathcal{V}(X_t, V_t) - \lambda\mathcal{V}(X_t', V_t'))\,\varepsilon f(r_t) + \gamma^{-1}c\,f(r_t)\,G_t. \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

Proof of Lemma 2.1. By (2.6), the paths of the process (Z_t) are almost surely continuously differentiable with derivative $dZ/dt = -\gamma Z + \gamma Q$. Therefore, $t \mapsto |Z_t|$ is almost surely absolutely continuous with

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}|Z_t| &= \frac{Z_t}{|Z_t|} \cdot (-\gamma Z_t + \gamma Q_t) \qquad \text{for a.e. } t \text{ such that } Z_t \ne 0, \text{ and} \\ \frac{d}{dt}|Z_t| &\le \gamma|Q_t| \qquad \text{for a.e. } t \text{ such that } Z_t = 0. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}|Z_t| \le -\gamma|Z_t| + \gamma|Q_t| \qquad \text{for a.e. } t \ge 0. \tag{2.15}$$

The process (Q_t) satisfies the SDE (2.8). Notice that by (2.4), the noise coefficient vanishes if $Q_t = 0$. Therefore, similarly to Lemma 4 in [16], we can apply Itô's formula to conclude that almost surely,

$$|Q_t| = |Q_0| + A_t^Q + \widetilde{M}_t^Q \qquad \text{for all } t \ge 0, \tag{2.16}$$

where (A_t^Q) and $(\widetilde{M}_t^Q)$ are the absolutely continuous process and the martingale given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_t^Q &= -u\gamma^{-1} \int_0^t e_s^T \cdot (\nabla U(X_s) - \nabla U(X_s')) \, ds, \\ \widetilde{M}_t^Q &= \sqrt{8u\gamma^{-1}} \int_0^t rc(Z_s, W_s) \, e_s^T \, dB_s^{rc}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that there is no Itô correction, because $\partial^2_{q/|q|}|q| = 0$ for $q \neq 0$ and the noise coefficient vanishes for $Q_t = 0$. By (2.15), (2.16) and the Lipschitz condition on ∇U, we conclude that $r_t = \alpha|Z_t| + |Q_t|$ has the semimartingale decomposition

$$r_t = |Q_0| + \alpha|Z_t| + A_t^Q + \widetilde{M}_t^Q,$$

where $t \mapsto \alpha|Z_t| + A_t^Q$ is almost surely absolutely continuous with derivative

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\alpha|Z_t| + A_t^Q) \leq \big((Lu\gamma^{-2} - \alpha)|Z_t| + \alpha|Q_t|\big) \, \gamma \qquad \text{for a.e. } t \geq 0. \tag{2.17}$$

Since by assumption, f is concave and piecewise C^2, we can now apply the Itô-Tanaka formula to $f(r_t)$. Let f'_- and f'' denote the left-sided first derivative and the almost everywhere defined second derivative. Notice that the generalized second derivative of f is a signed measure μ_f such that $\mu_f(dr) \leq f''(r)\, dr$. We obtain a semimartingale decomposition

$$e^{ct} f(r_t) = f(r_0) + \widetilde{A}_t + \widetilde{M}_t \tag{2.18}$$

with the martingale part

$$\widetilde{M}_t = \sqrt{8u\gamma^{-1}} \int_0^t e^{cs} \, f'_-(r_s) \, rc(Z_s, W_s) \, e_s^T \, dB_s^{rc} \tag{2.19}$$

and a continuous finite-variation process $(\widetilde{A}_t)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} d\widetilde{A}_t &= \big(c\, f(r_t) + ((Lu\gamma^{-2} - \alpha)|Z_t| + \alpha|Q_t|) \, \gamma \, f'_-(r_t)\big) \, e^{ct} \, dt \\ &\quad + \big(4u\gamma^{-1} \, rc(Z_t, W_t)^2 \, f''(r_t)\big) \, e^{ct} \, dt. \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

Next, we consider the time evolution of the process $G_t = 1 + \varepsilon\mathcal{V}(X_t, V_t) + \varepsilon\mathcal{V}(X_t', V_t')$. An application of Itô's formula shows that by (2.1),

$$\begin{aligned} dG_t &= \varepsilon(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V})(X_t, V_t) \, dt + \varepsilon(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V})(X_t', V_t') \, dt \\ &\quad + \varepsilon\sqrt{2u\gamma}(\nabla_v \mathcal{V}(X_t, V_t)) - \nabla_v \mathcal{V}(X_t', V_t'))^T rc(Z_t, W_t) \, e_t e_t^T \, dB_t^{rc} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon\sqrt{2u\gamma}(\nabla_v \mathcal{V}(X_t, V_t)) + \nabla_v \mathcal{V}(X_t', V_t'))^T rc(Z_t, W_t) \, (I_d - e_t e_t^T) \, dB_t^{rc} \\ &\quad + \varepsilon\sqrt{2u\gamma}(\nabla_v \mathcal{V}(X_t, V_t)) + \nabla_v \mathcal{V}(X_t', V_t'))^T sc(Z_t, W_t) \, dB_t^{sc} \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

Hence by (2.18), (2.21), the Itô product rule and (2.19), we obtain the semimartingale decomposition

$$e^{ct} \rho_t = e^{ct} \, f(r_t) \, G_t = \rho_0 + M_t + A_t, \tag{2.22}$$

where (M_t) is a continuous local martingale, and

$$\begin{aligned} dA_t &= G_t\, d\widetilde{A}_t + \varepsilon\, e^{ct}\, f(r_t)\, ((\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V})(X_t,V_t) + (\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V})(X_t',V_t'))\, dt \\ &\quad + 4\varepsilon u\, e^{ct}\, f_-'(r_t)\, rc(Z_t,W_t)^2 (\nabla_v \mathcal{V}(X_t,V_t)) - \nabla_v \mathcal{V}(X_t',V_t'))^T e_t\, dt. \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

Here we have used that B^{rc} and B^{sc} are independent Brownian motions in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Now recall that by Lemma 1.3,

$$\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V} \;\le\; (d + A - \lambda \mathcal{V})\, \gamma. \tag{2.24}$$

Furthermore, a simple computation shows that by (1.10),

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_v \mathcal{V}(X_t,V_t) - \nabla_v \mathcal{V}(X_t',V_t')| &= |\frac{1}{2} u^{-1}\gamma\, \left(X_t + 2\gamma^{-1} V_t - X_t' - 2\gamma^{-1} V_t'\right)| \\ &\le u^{-1}\gamma\, (|Q_t| + |Z_t|/2) \le u^{-1}\gamma \max(1,(2\alpha)^{-1})\, r_t. \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

By combining (2.23), (2.20), (2.24) and (2.25) we finally obtain

$$dA_t \;\le\; \gamma\, e^{ct}\, K_t\, dt, \qquad \text{where}$$

$$\begin{aligned} dK_t = \big(&\gamma^{-1} c f(r_t) + ((Lu\gamma^{-2} - \alpha)|Z_t| + \alpha|Q_t|) f_-'(r_t) + 4u\gamma^{-2} rc(Z_t,W_t)^2 f''(r_t)\big)\, G_t \\ &+ \varepsilon f(r_t)\, (2(d+A) - \lambda\mathcal{V}(X_t,V_t) - \lambda\mathcal{V}(X_t',V_t')) \\ &+ 4\varepsilon \max(1,(2\alpha)^{-1}) r_t f_-'(r_t) rc(Z_t,W_t)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The assertion now follows from (2.22) by setting $\alpha = (1+\eta)Lu\gamma^{-2}$. □

3. Contractivity in different regions

As above suppose that $\alpha = (1+\eta)Lu\gamma^{-2}$ for some $\eta \in (0,\infty)$. We will choose ε and c such that

$$(d+A)\,\varepsilon \;=\; 4\,c/\gamma. \tag{3.1}$$

This choice guarantees in particular that the terms $2(d+A)\varepsilon$ and $\gamma^{-1}c$ in (2.14) are of comparable order.

We consider a coupling as introduced in Section 2. In order to make ρ_t a contraction on average, we have to choose the parameters such that $K_t \le 0$. This will be achieved up to an error term which vanishes as $\xi \downarrow 0$. In order to bound K_t, we distinguish between different regions of the state space:

(i) $|Q_t| \ge \xi$ and $r_t \le R_1$. Here by (2.5), $rc(Z_t,W_t) = 1$. Therefore, by (2.14) and (3.1), and since $|Q_t| \le r_t$ and $G_t \ge 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} K_t \;\le\; & 4u\gamma^{-2}\, f''(r_t)\, G_t + ((1+\eta)Lu\gamma^{-2} + 4\varepsilon \max(1,(2\alpha)^{-1}))\, r_t\, f_-'(r_t)\, G_t \\ & + 9\,\gamma^{-1} c\, f(r_t)\, G_t. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly to [16], we can now ensure that $K_t \le 0$ by choosing f appropriately. We set

$$f(r) = \int_0^{r\wedge R_1} \varphi(s)\, g(s)\, ds, \qquad \text{where} \tag{3.2}$$

$$\varphi(s) = \exp\left(-(1+\eta)Ls^2/8 - \gamma^2 u^{-1}\varepsilon \max(1,(2\alpha)^{-1})s^2/2\right), \qquad \text{and} \tag{3.3}$$

$$g(r) = 1 - \frac{9}{4}c\gamma u^{-1}\int_0^r \Phi(s)\varphi(s)^{-1}\, ds \qquad \text{with } \Phi(s) = \int_0^s \varphi(x)\, dx. \tag{3.4}$$

Then $4u\gamma^{-2}\varphi'(r_t) + ((1+\eta)Lu\gamma^{-2} + 4\varepsilon\max(1,(2\alpha)^{-1}))r_t\varphi(r_t) = 0$, and hence

$$K_t \le 4u\gamma^{-2}\varphi(r_t)g'(r_t)G_t + 9\gamma^{-1}c\,\Phi(r_t)G_t \le 0. \tag{3.5}$$

In order to ensure $g(r) \ge 1/2$ for $r \le R_1$, we have to assume

$$c \le \frac{2}{9}\, u\gamma^{-1} \Big/ \int_0^{R_1} \Phi(s)\varphi(s)^{-1}\, ds\ . \tag{3.6}$$

(ii) $|Q_t| < \xi$ and $r_t \le R_1$. In this region, there is a transition from reflection coupling to synchronous coupling, which is applied for $Q_t = 0$. Hence we can not rely on the additional contraction properties gained by applying reflection coupling and choosing f sufficiently concave. Instead, however, we can use that

$$|Q_t| \le \xi \qquad \text{and} \qquad \alpha|Z_t| = r_t - |Q_t| \ge r_t - \xi. \tag{3.7}$$

By the choice of f and since $g \ge 1/2$, we obtain, similarly to Case (i),

$$\begin{aligned} K_t &\le \left(4u\gamma^{-2} f''(r_t)\, G_t + 4\varepsilon\max(1,(2\alpha)^{-1})r_t f'_-(r_t)\right) rc(Z_t,W_t)^2 \\ &\quad -\tfrac{\eta}{1+\eta} r_t\, f'_-(r_t)\, G_t + (1+\alpha)\xi f'_-(r_t)\, G_t + 9\gamma^{-1}c\, f(r_t)\, G_t \\ &\le -\tfrac{1}{2}\,\tfrac{\eta}{1+\eta}\, r_t\, \varphi(r_t)G_t + 9\gamma^{-1}c\,\Phi(r_t)\, G_t + (1+\alpha)\xi G_t. \end{aligned}$$

In order to ensure that the upper bound converges to 0 as $\xi \downarrow 0$, we assume

$$c \le \frac{1}{18}\,\gamma\,\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}\,\inf_{r\in(0,R_1]}\frac{r\varphi(r)}{\Phi(r)}. \tag{3.8}$$

Under this condition, we obtain

$$K_t \le (1+\alpha)\,\xi\, G_t. \tag{3.9}$$

(iii) $r_t > R_1$. Here $f'_-(r_t) = 0$. Hence by (2.14), (2.11), (3.1) and (1.18),

$$\begin{aligned} K_t &= \left[2(d+A) + \gamma^{-1}c\varepsilon^{-1} - (\lambda - \gamma^{-1}c)(\mathcal{V}(X_t,V_t) + \mathcal{V}(X'_t,V'_t))\right]\, \varepsilon\, f(r_t) \\ &\le \left[\tfrac{9}{4}(d+A) - \tfrac{15}{16}\lambda\,(\mathcal{V}(X_t,V_t) + \mathcal{V}(X'_t,V'_t))\right]\, \varepsilon\, f(r_t) \le 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

provided we assume

$$c \le \gamma\lambda/16. \tag{3.11}$$

Notice that the functions φ, g and f in (3.3), (3.4), (3.2), and the constants α, ε determining ρ do not depend on the value of ξ. Therefore, by combining Lemma 2.1, (3.5), (3.9) and (3.10), we obtain the following general result:

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\alpha = (1+\eta)Lu\gamma^{-2}$ for some $\eta \in (0,\infty)$, and let $\varepsilon = 4\gamma^{-1}c/(d+A)$ for a positive constant c such that*

$$c \;\le\; \gamma \min\left(\frac{2}{9}u\gamma^{-2}\Big/\int_0^{R_1}\frac{\Phi(s)}{\varphi(s)}\,ds\,,\;\frac{1}{18}\,\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}\,\inf_{s\in(0,R_1]}\frac{s\varphi(s)}{\Phi(s)}\,,\;\frac{1}{16}\lambda\right). \tag{3.12}$$

Moreover, let $f:[0,\infty)\to[0,\infty)$ be defined by (3.2), (3.3) and (3.4). Then for any $t\ge 0$ and for any probability measures μ,ν on $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$,

$$\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu p_t,\nu p_t) \;\le\; e^{-ct}\,\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu,\nu). \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. Let Γ be a coupling of two probability measures μ and ν on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu,\nu)<\infty$. We consider the coupling process $((X_t,V_t),(X_t',V_t'))$ introduced in Section 2 with initial law $((X_0,V_0),(X_0',V_0'))\sim\Gamma$. By (3.12), the conditions (3.6), (3.8), (3.11) are satisfied. Therefore, in each of the cases (i), (ii) and (iii) considered above, we obtain $K_t\le(1+\alpha)\xi G_t$. Therefore we apply Lemma 2.1. By taking expectations in (2.13), evaluated at localizing stopping times $T_n\uparrow t$ and applying Fatou's lemma as $n\to\infty$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\rho_t] \;\le\; e^{-ct}\,\mathbb{E}[\rho_0] \,+\, \gamma(1+\alpha)\xi\int_0^t e^{c(s-t)}\,\mathbb{E}[G_s]\,ds \tag{3.14}$$

for any $\xi>0$ and $t\ge 0$. Note that the coupling process and the coupling distance ρ_t still depend on the value of ξ. On the other hand, the expectation of G_s does not depend on ξ. Indeed, by (2.11),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[G_s] &= \mathbb{E}[1+\varepsilon\mathcal{V}(X_s,V_s)+\varepsilon\mathcal{V}(X_s',V_s')]\\ &= 1+\varepsilon\int p_s\mathcal{V}\,d\mu+\varepsilon\int p_s\mathcal{V}\,d\nu.\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Since $\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu,\nu)<\infty$, both $\int\mathcal{V}\,d\mu$ and $\int\mathcal{V}\,d\nu$ are finite. Therefore, by the Lyapunov condition in Lemma 1.3, the expectation in (3.15) is finite, too.

Since $((X_t,V_t),(X_t',V_t'))$ is a coupling of μp_t and νp_t, we have $\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu p_t,\nu p_t)\le\mathbb{E}[\rho_t]$ for any $\xi>0$. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}[\rho_0]=\int\rho\,d\Gamma$. Hence by applying (3.14) and taking the limit $\xi\downarrow 0$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu p_t,\nu p_t) \;\le\; e^{-ct}\int\rho\,d\Gamma \qquad \text{for any } t\ge 0. \tag{3.16}$$

The assertion follows since (3.16) holds for an arbitrary coupling of μ and ν. □

4. Choice of the constants

The function

$$\varphi(s) \;=\; \exp\left(-(1+\eta)Ls^2/8-u^{-1}\gamma^2\varepsilon\max(1,(2\alpha)^{-1})\,s^2/2\right) \tag{4.1}$$

determining the metric in Theorem 3.1 still depends on the values of the constants $\eta\in(0,\infty)$, $\alpha=(1+\eta)Lu\gamma^{-2}$ and $\varepsilon\in(0,\infty)$. In order to prove our main result, we now choose explicit values for η and ε (and hence for α and c). We first discuss how to choose these constants in order to optimize the resulting bound for the contraction rate in (3.12) approximately, and then we apply Theorem 3.1 with the chosen constants. A first condition we want to be satisfied is that $\varphi(s)$ is bounded

below by the minimal possible value $\exp(-Ls^2/8)$ up to a multiplicative constants. Therefore, we choose η and ε such that

$$\varphi(s) \;\geq\; e^{-2}\exp(-Ls^2/8) \qquad \text{for any } s \in [0, R_1]. \tag{4.2}$$

By (4.1), this bound holds true if

$$\eta \;=\; 8/(LR_1^2) = \Lambda^{-1} \qquad \text{or, equivalently,} \tag{4.3}$$

$$\alpha \;=\; (1+\Lambda^{-1})Lu\gamma^{-2} \;=\; (L + 8R_1^{-2})u\gamma^{-2}, \qquad \text{and} \tag{4.4}$$

$$\varepsilon \;\leq\; 2\min(1, 2\alpha)\, u\gamma^{-2}R_1^{-2}. \tag{4.5}$$

We recall from (1.16) that

$$R_1 \;=\; \sqrt{(1+\alpha)^2+\alpha^2}\, R_0, \quad \text{where} \quad R_0 \;:=\; u^{1/2}\gamma^{-1}\left(\frac{96(d+A)}{5\lambda(1-2\lambda)}\right)^{1/2}. \tag{4.6}$$

In particular, R_1^{-2} is a decreasing function of α, and hence there are unique values $\alpha, \eta \in (0,\infty)$ such that (4.4) and (4.3) are satisfied. We fix η and α correspondingly, and then we choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that (4.5) is satisfied. By (3.1) and (4.6) the condition (4.5) on ε is equivalent to the following additional constraint on the constant c in Theorem 3.1:

$$\begin{aligned} c \;&=\; \gamma\varepsilon(d+A)/4 \\ &\leq\; \min(1,2\alpha)\, u\gamma^{-1}(d+A)R_1^{-2}/2 \;=\; \frac{5}{192}\frac{\min(1,2\alpha)}{(1+\alpha)^2+\alpha^2}\,\gamma\lambda(1-2\lambda). \end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

Since the last expression is smaller than $\gamma\lambda/16$, we see that Theorem 3.1 applies with parameters η and ε satisfying (4.3) and (4.5) whenever c is smaller than

$$\gamma \min\left(\frac{5}{192}\frac{\min(1,2\alpha)\lambda(1-2\lambda)}{(1+\alpha)^2+\alpha^2}, \frac{2}{9}u\gamma^{-2}\middle/\int_0^{R_1}\frac{\Phi(s)}{\varphi(s)}\,ds, \frac{1}{18}\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}\inf_{s\in(0,R_1]}\frac{s\varphi(s)}{\Phi(s)}\right). \tag{4.8}$$

We can now complete the proof of Theorem 1.4 by deriving an explicit lower bound for the right hand side of (4.8).

Proof of Theorem 1.4. We fix η and α as in (4.3), (4.4) and we choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that (4.5) holds. For these parameters we give explicit lower bounds for the three terms in the mininum in (4.8):

1. By (4.4), (4.6) and (1.9),

$$\begin{aligned} Lu\gamma^{-2} \;&\leq\; \alpha \;\leq\; (L+8R_0^{-2})u\gamma^{-2} \;\leq\; Lu\gamma^{-2} \;+\; \frac{5}{12}\lambda/(d+A) \\ &\leq\; (1+\frac{5}{6}(d+A)^{-1})Lu\gamma^{-2} \;\leq\; \frac{11}{6}Lu\gamma^{-2}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Therefore, and since $\lambda \leq 1/4$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\min(1,2\alpha)}{(1+\alpha)^2+\alpha^2} \;&\geq\; \min\left(\frac{4}{5}\alpha, \frac{1}{10}\alpha^{-2}\right), \\ \frac{5}{192}\frac{\min(1,2\alpha)\lambda(1-2\lambda)}{(1+\alpha)^2+\alpha^2} \;&\geq\; \frac{1}{96}\,\min\left(Lu\gamma^{-2}, \frac{1}{32}(Lu\gamma^{-2})^{-2}\right)\,\lambda. \end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

2. Recall that $\Phi(r) = \int_0^r \varphi(s)\,ds$. Since $\varphi(s) \le \exp(-Ls^2/8)$, we have

$$\Phi(r) \;\le\; \int_0^\infty \exp(-Ls^2/8)\,ds \;=\; \sqrt{2\pi/L} \quad \text{for any } r \ge 0. \tag{4.11}$$

Furthermore, by (4.2),

$$e^{-2}\int_0^{R_1} 1/\varphi \;\le\; \int_0^{R_1} \exp(Ls^2/8)\,ds \;\le\; \frac{8}{LR_1}\exp(LR_1^2/8).$$

Here we have used that $\int_0^x \exp(u^2/2)\,du \le 2x^{-1}\exp(x^2/2)$ for $x > 0$. We obtain

$$\int_0^{R_1}(\Phi/\varphi) \;\le\; \Phi(R_1)\int_0^{R_1} 1/\varphi \;\le\; 8\sqrt{2\pi}e^2L^{-3/2}R_1^{-1}e^{LR_1^2/8} \;=\; 4\sqrt{\pi}e^2L^{-1}\Lambda^{-1/2}e^{\Lambda},$$

and thus

$$\frac{9}{2}u\gamma^{-2}\Big/\int_0^{R_1}(\Phi/\varphi) \ge \frac{1}{18}\pi^{-1/2}e^{-2}Lu\gamma^{-2}\Lambda^{1/2}e^{-\Lambda}. \tag{4.12}$$

3. By (4.3) and (1.25), $\eta \le 5/6$ and hence

$$\frac{\eta}{1+\eta} \;\ge\; \frac{6}{11}\eta \;=\; \frac{6}{11}\Lambda^{-1}. \tag{4.13}$$

Moreover, for $r \le \min(2/\sqrt{L}, R_1)$,

$$r\varphi(r)/\Phi(r) \;\ge\; \varphi(r) \;\ge\; e^{-1}e^{-(1+\eta)Lr^2/8} \;\ge\; e^{-1}e^{-11/12} \;\ge e^{-2}$$

by (4.1) and the choice of ε, and for $2/\sqrt{L} \le r \le R_1$,

$$r\varphi(r)/\Phi(r) \;\ge\; \sqrt{L/(2\pi)}R_1\varphi(R_1) \;\ge\; 2\pi^{-1/2}\sqrt{LR_1^2/8}\,e^{-LR_1^2/8},$$

where we have used that $s\varphi(s) = se^{-\beta s^2}$, $\beta \ge L/8$, is a decreasing function for $s \ge 2/\sqrt{L}$. Since $\Lambda = LR_1^2/8 \ge 1$ by (1.25), we obtain

$$r\varphi(r)/\Phi(r) \;\ge\; 2\pi^{-1/2}e^{-2}\Lambda^{1/2}e^{-\Lambda} \qquad \text{for all } r \in (0, R_1],$$

and hence by (4.13),

$$\frac{1}{18}\frac{\eta}{1+\eta}\inf_{s\in(0,R_1]}\frac{s\varphi(s)}{\Phi(s)} \;\ge\; \frac{1}{18}\pi^{-1/2}e^{-2}\Lambda^{-1/2}\,e^{-\Lambda}. \tag{4.14}$$

By combining (4.10), (4.12) and (4.14), we see that the right hand side of (4.8) is lower bounded by the minimum of the expression on the right hand sides of (4.10), (4.12) and (4.14). As a consequence we see that Theorem 3.1 applies with constants η given by (4.3) and $\varepsilon = 4\gamma^{-1}c/(d+A)$ satisfying (4.5), provided $c \le c_\star$, where

$$c_\star \;=\; \frac{1}{384}\,\gamma\,\min\left(\lambda Lu\gamma^{-2},\; \lambda(Lu\gamma^{-2})^{-2}/8,\; \Lambda^{1/2}e^{-\Lambda}Lu\gamma^{-2},\; \Lambda^{-1/2}\,e^{-\Lambda}\right).$$

Here we have used that $18\pi^{1/2}e^2 \le 384$. By (1.22), and since $\Lambda \ge 1$ and $x^{3/2}e^{-x} < 1$ for $x \ge 1$, we also have

$$\frac{\lambda}{8(Lu\gamma^{-2})^2} \;\ge\; \left(\frac{\lambda}{2Lu\gamma^{-2}}\right)^2\frac{1}{2\lambda} \;\ge\; \Lambda^{-2} \ge \Lambda^{-1/2}e^{-\Lambda}.$$

Therefore, the second term in the minimum defining $c_\star$ can be dropped and the value $c_\star$ is equal to the contraction rate (1.21) in the assertion of Theorem 1.4. Thus we have shown that Theorem 1.4 is indeed a special case of Theorem 3.1. □

Proof of Corollary 1.7. By (1.12), for $(x,v),(x',v') \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$,

$$|(x,v)-(x',v')|^2 \;\le\; (1+\gamma)^2 \max(1,\alpha^{-2})\, r((x,v),(x,v'))^2. \tag{4.15}$$

Moreover, if $r := r((x,v),(x,v')) \le \min(1,R_1)$, then by (1.14) and (1.24),

$$r^2 \;\le\; r \;\le\; f(r)/f'_-(R_1) \;\le\; 2e^{2+\Lambda} f(r) \;\le\; 2e^{2+\Lambda}\rho((x,v),(x,v')), \tag{4.16}$$

and if $r \ge \min(1,R_1)$, then by (1.17) and since $\lambda \le 1/4$ and $\varepsilon = 4\gamma^{-1}c/(d+A)$,

$$\begin{aligned} r^2 &\le 16\,((1+\alpha)^2+\alpha^2)u\gamma^{-2}\varepsilon^{-1}\,(1+\varepsilon\mathcal{V}(x,v)+\varepsilon\mathcal{V}(x',v')) \\ &\le 4\,((1+\alpha)^2+\alpha^2)(d+A)u\gamma^{-1}c^{-1}\,\rho((x,v),(x,v'))/f(\min(1,R_1)) \\ &\le 8e^{2+\Lambda}\,(1+2\alpha+2\alpha^2)(d+A)u\gamma^{-1}c^{-1}\,\rho((x,v),(x,v'))/\min(1,R_1). \end{aligned} \tag{4.17}$$

Combining the above bounds with Theorem 1.4 implies that

$$\mathcal{W}^2(\mu p_t,\nu p_t)^2 \;\le\; C\,\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu p_t,\nu p_t) \;\le\; Ce^{-ct}\,\mathcal{W}_\rho(\mu,\nu) \quad \text{for any } t\ge 0.$$

Uniqueness of the invariant probability measure now follows by standard arguments. □

Proof of Corollary 1.10. By (1.31) and since $Lu\gamma^{-2} \le 1/30$,

$$\lambda L u\gamma^{-2} \;\ge\; \frac{15}{8\ell}(Lu\gamma^{-2})^2. \tag{4.18}$$

Furthermore, by (1.32), (1.30) and (1.31),

$$d \;\le\; \Lambda \;\le\; 2(d+(L\mathcal{R}^2-\beta)/8)L\mathcal{R}^2/\beta \;\le\; \Lambda_1, \qquad \text{whence}$$

$$\Lambda^{1/2}e^{-\Lambda}Lu\gamma^{-2} \;\ge\; d^{1/2}e^{-\Lambda_1}Lu\gamma^{-2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda^{-1/2}e^{-\Lambda} \;\ge\; \Lambda_1^{-1/2}e^{-\Lambda_1}. \tag{4.19}$$

The first inequality in (1.34) now follows from Theorem 1.4, (4.18) and (4.19). Moreover, the second inequality holds since by (1.30), $\gamma \ge \sqrt{30\,Lu} \ge \sqrt{30\,\beta u}/\mathcal{R}$. □

Appendix A. Drift conditions and Lyapunov functions

Proof of Lemma 1.3. By (1.2), we have $\mathcal{L}U(x) = v\cdot\nabla U(x)$, $\mathcal{L}|x|^2 = 2x\cdot v$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\,\tfrac12|\gamma^{-1}v|^2 &= u\gamma^{-1}d \,-\, \gamma^{-1}|v|^2 \,-\, u\gamma^{-2}v\cdot\nabla U(x), \\ \mathcal{L}\,\tfrac12|x+\gamma^{-1}v|^2 &= u\gamma^{-1}d \,-\, u\gamma^{-1}(x+\gamma^{-1}v)\cdot\nabla U(x), \qquad \text{and hence} \\ \mathcal{L}\mathcal{V}(x,v) &= \tfrac12\gamma\,\big(2d \,-\, x\cdot\nabla U(x) \,-\, u^{-1}|v|^2 \,-\, \lambda u^{-1}\gamma\, x\cdot v\big) \\ &\le \gamma\,\big(d+A-\lambda U(x)-\tfrac14\lambda u^{-1}\gamma^2\,(|x|^2+2x\cdot\gamma^{-1}v+2\lambda^{-1}|\gamma^{-1}v|^2)\big) \\ &= \gamma\,(d+A-\lambda\mathcal{V}(x,v)). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Lemma 1.9. Suppose that Assumption 1.8 is satisfied, and let $A = (L\mathcal{R}^2 - \beta)/8$. Then by (1.29), (1.28) and (1.30),

$$\begin{aligned} x \cdot \nabla U(x) &= \frac{|x|}{\mathcal{R}} \frac{\mathcal{R}x}{|x|} \nabla U\left(\frac{\mathcal{R}x}{|x|}\right) + x \cdot \left(\nabla U(x) - \nabla U\left(\frac{\mathcal{R}x}{|x|}\right)\right) \\ &\geq \beta\mathcal{R}^{-1}|x| - L\,(\mathcal{R} - |x|)\,|x| \;\geq\; \beta\mathcal{R}^{-2}|x|^2 - (L - \beta\mathcal{R}^{-2})(\mathcal{R} - |x|)|x| \\ &\geq \beta\mathcal{R}^{-2}|x|^2 - 2A \end{aligned}$$

holds for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ s.t. $0 < |x| \leq \mathcal{R}$. Noting that by (1.27) and (1.28),

$$U(x) \;\leq\; U(0) + L|x|^2/2 \;=\; L|x|^2/2,$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} U(x) + \frac{1}{4}u^{-1}\gamma^2|x|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{4}(2L + u^{-1}\gamma^2)|x|^2 \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2}x \cdot \nabla U(x) + A\right)\left(1 + L^{-1}u^{-1}\gamma^2/2\right)\beta^{-1}L\mathcal{R}^2 \end{aligned}$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Hence (1.8) holds with λ given by (1.31). In particular, $Lu\gamma^{-2}\lambda^{-1} \geq L\mathcal{R}^2/(2\beta)$, and hence by (1.22),

$$\Lambda \;\geq\; \frac{6}{5}\,(d + A)\,L\mathcal{R}^2/\beta. \tag{A.1}$$

Now suppose first that $Lu\gamma^{-2} \leq 1/8$. Then since $\beta \leq L\mathcal{R}^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= \frac{2\beta}{L\mathcal{R}^2}\,\frac{Lu\gamma^{-2}}{1 + 2Lu\gamma^{-2}}, \\ (1 - 2\lambda)^{-1} &= \frac{1 + 2Lu\gamma^{-2}}{1 + (2 - 4\beta L^{-1}\mathcal{R}^{-2})Lu\gamma^{-2}} \;\leq\; 1 + \frac{4Lu\gamma^{-2}}{1 - 2Lu\gamma^{-2}}\,\frac{\beta}{L\mathcal{R}^2} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{16}{3}\,\frac{\beta}{L\mathcal{R}^2}\,Lu\gamma^{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence by (1.22),

$$\Lambda \;\leq\; \frac{6}{5}(d + A)\beta^{-1}L\mathcal{R}^2\,(1 + 2\alpha + 2\alpha^2)(1 + 2Lu\gamma^{-2})(1 + \frac{16}{3}Lu\gamma^{-2}). \tag{A.2}$$

By (1.23), $\alpha \leq 11\,Lu\gamma^{-2}/6 \leq 11/48$. Noting that $Lu\gamma^{-2} \leq 1/8$, (1.32) follows from (A.1) and (A.2). □

References

1. Dominique Bakry, Patrick Cattiaux, and Arnaud Guillin, *Rate of convergence for ergodic continuous Markov processes: Lyapunov versus Poincaré*, J. Funct. Anal. **254** (2008), no. 3, 727–759. MR 2381160
2. Sayan Banerjee and Wilfrid S. Kendall, *Coupling the Kolmogorov diffusion: maximality and efficiency considerations*, Adv. in Appl. Probab. **48** (2016), no. A, 15–35.
3. F. Baudoin, *Wasserstein contraction properties for hypoelliptic diffusions*, ArXiv e-prints (2016).
4. Gérard Ben Arous, Michael Cranston, and Wilfrid S. Kendall, *Coupling constructions for hypoelliptic diffusions: two examples*, Stochastic analysis (Ithaca, NY, 1993), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 57, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1995, pp. 193–212.

5. François Bolley, Arnaud Guillin, and Florent Malrieu, *Trend to equilibrium and particle approximation for a weakly selfconsistent Vlasov-Fokker-Planck equation*, M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal. **44** (2010), no. 5, 867–884.
6. N. Bou-Rabee and J. M. Sanz-Serna, *Randomized Hamiltonian Monte Carlo*, ArXiv e-prints (2015).
7. Simone Calogero, *Exponential convergence to equilibrium for kinetic Fokker-Planck equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **37** (2012), no. 8, 1357–1390.
8. Mu Fa Chen and Shao Fu Li, *Coupling methods for multidimensional diffusion processes*, Ann. Probab. **17** (1989), no. 1, 151–177.
9. Mu-Fa Chen and Feng-Yu Wang, *Estimation of spectral gap for elliptic operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **349** (1997), no. 3, 1239–1267.
10. L. Desvillettes and C. Villani, *On the trend to global equilibrium in spatially inhomogeneous entropy-dissipating systems: the linear Fokker-Planck equation*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **54** (2001), no. 1, 1–42.
11. Jean Dolbeault, Clément Mouhot, and Christian Schmeiser, *Hypocoercivity for linear kinetic equations conserving mass*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **367** (2015), no. 6, 3807–3828.
12. Simon Duane, Anthony D Kennedy, Brian J Pendleton, and Duncan Roweth, *Hybrid monte carlo*, Physics letters B **195** (1987), no. 2, 216–222.
13. A. Eberle, A. Guillin, and R. Zimmer, *Quantitative Harris type theorems for diffusions and McKean-Vlasov processes*, ArXiv e-prints (2016).
14. A. Eberle and R. Zimmer, *Sticky couplings of multidimensional diffusions with different drifts*, ArXiv e-prints (2016).
15. Andreas Eberle, *Reflection coupling and Wasserstein contractivity without convexity*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **349** (2011), no. 19-20, 1101–1104.
16. ———, *Reflection couplings and contraction rates for diffusions*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **166** (2016), no. 3-4, 851–886.
17. Andreas Eberle, *A coupling approach to the kinetic Langevin equation on the torus*, Preprint (2017).
18. J.-P. Eckmann and M. Hairer, *Spectral properties of hypoelliptic operators*, Comm. Math. Phys. **235** (2003), no. 2, 233–253.
19. Albert Einstein, *Über die von der molekularkinetischen Theorie der Wärme geforderte Bewegung von in ruhenden Flüssigkeiten suspendierten Teilchen*, Annalen der Physik **322** (1905), no. 8, 549–560.
20. J. Gorham, A. B. Duncan, S. J. Vollmer, and L. Mackey, *Measuring Sample Quality with Diffusions*, ArXiv e-prints (2016).
21. Martin Grothaus and Patrik Stilgenbauer, *Hypocoercivity for Kolmogorov backward evolution equations and applications*, J. Funct. Anal. **267** (2014), no. 10, 3515–3556.
22. ———, *Hilbert space hypocoercivity for the Langevin dynamics revisited*, Methods Funct. Anal. Topology **22** (2016), no. 2, 152–168.
23. Arnaud Guillin and Pierre Monmarché, *Optimal linear drift for the speed of convergence of an hypoelliptic diffusion*, Electron. Commun. Probab. **21** (2016), Paper No. 74, 14. MR 3568348
24. M. Hairer, *Exponential mixing properties of stochastic PDEs through asymptotic coupling*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **124** (2002), no. 3, 345–380. MR 1939651
25. M. Hairer and J. C. Mattingly, *Yet another look at Harris' ergodic theorem for Markov chains*, Seminar on Stochastic Analysis, Random Fields and Applications VI, Progr. Probab., vol. 63, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2011, pp. 109–117.
26. M. Hairer, J. C. Mattingly, and M. Scheutzow, *Asymptotic coupling and a general form of Harris' theorem with applications to stochastic delay equations*, Probab. Theory Related Fields **149** (2011), no. 1-2, 223–259.
27. Bernard Helffer and Francis Nier, *Hypoelliptic estimates and spectral theory for Fokker-Planck operators and Witten Laplacians*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1862, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.

28. Frédéric Hérau, *Hypocoercivity and exponential time decay for the linear inhomogeneous relaxation Boltzmann equation*, Asymptot. Anal. **46** (2006), no. 3-4, 349–359.
29. Frédéric Hérau and Francis Nier, *Isotropic hypoellipticity and trend to equilibrium for the Fokker-Planck equation with a high-degree potential*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **171** (2004), no. 2, 151–218.
30. Paul Langevin, *Sur la théorie du mouvement brownien*, CR Acad. Sci. Paris **146** (1908), no. 530-533, 530.
31. Tony Lelièvre, Mathias Rousset, and Gabriel Stoltz, *Free energy computations*, Imperial College Press, London, 2010, A mathematical perspective.
32. Torgny Lindvall and L. C. G. Rogers, *Coupling of multidimensional diffusions by reflection*, Ann. Probab. **14** (1986), no. 3, 860–872.
33. J. C. Mattingly, A. M. Stuart, and D. J. Higham, *Ergodicity for SDEs and approximations: locally Lipschitz vector fields and degenerate noise*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **101** (2002), no. 2, 185–232.
34. Jonathan C. Mattingly, *Exponential convergence for the stochastically forced Navier-Stokes equations and other partially dissipative dynamics*, Comm. Math. Phys. **230** (2002), no. 3, 421–462. MR 1937652
35. S. Mischler and C. Mouhot, *Exponential stability of slowly decaying solutions to the kinetic-Fokker-Planck equation*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **221** (2016), no. 2, 677–723.
36. Radford M. Neal, *MCMC using Hamiltonian dynamics*, Handbook of Markov chain Monte Carlo, Chapman & Hall/CRC Handb. Mod. Stat. Methods, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2011, pp. 113–162.
37. Edward Nelson, *Dynamical theories of Brownian motion*, vol. 2, Princeton University Press, 1967.
38. Grigorios A. Pavliotis, *Stochastic processes and applications*, Texts in Applied Mathematics, vol. 60, Springer, New York, 2014, Diffusion processes, the Fokker-Planck and Langevin equations.
39. Luc Rey-Bellet and Lawrence E. Thomas, *Exponential convergence to non-equilibrium stationary states in classical statistical mechanics*, Comm. Math. Phys. **225** (2002), no. 2, 305–329.
40. Zeev Schuss, *Theory and applications of stochastic processes*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, vol. 170, Springer, New York, 2010, An analytical approach. MR 2583642
41. D. Talay, *Stochastic Hamiltonian systems: exponential convergence to the invariant measure, and discretization by the implicit Euler scheme*, Markov Process. Related Fields **8** (2002), no. 2, 163–198, Inhomogeneous random systems (Cergy-Pontoise, 2001).
42. C. Villani, *Optimal transport*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 338, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2009, Old and new.
43. Cédric Villani, *Hypocoercive diffusion operators*, Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Sez. B Artic. Ric. Mat. (8) **10** (2007), no. 2, 257–275.
44. ———, *Hypocoercivity*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **202** (2009), no. 950, iv+141.
45. Marian von Smoluchowski, *Zur kinetischen Theorie der Brownschen Molekularbewegung und der Suspensionen*, Annalen der Physik **326** (1906), no. 14, 756–780.
46. Liming Wu, *Large and moderate deviations and exponential convergence for stochastic damping Hamiltonian systems*, Stochastic Process. Appl. **91** (2001), no. 2, 205–238.
47. Raphael Zimmer, *Couplings and Kantorovich contractions with explicit rates for diffusions*, PhD thesis, University of Bonn (2017).
48. ———, *Explicit contraction rates for a class of degenerate and infinite-dimensional diffusions*, Stochastics and Partial Differential Equations: Analysis and Computations (2017), 1–32.

Universität Bonn, Institut für Angewandte Mathematik, Endenicher Allee 60, 53115 Bonn, Germany
E-mail address: eberle@uni-bonn.de, Raphael.Zimmer@uni-bonn.de
URL: http://www.uni-bonn.de/∼eberle

Laboratoire de Mathématiques Blaise Pascal, CNRS - UMR 6620, Université Clermont-Auvergne, Avenue des landais,, 63177 Aubiere cedex, France
E-mail address: guillin@math.univ-bpclermont.fr
URL: http://math.univ-bpclermont.fr/∼guillin